

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/966,309 09/28/2001		9/28/2001	Dirk Kranendonk	25098A	5049	
22889	7590	11/15/2006	•	EXAMINER		
OWENS CO			TORRES VELAZQUEZ, NORCA LIZ			
2790 COLUMBUS ROAD GRANVILLE, OH 43023				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	-,			1771		

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/966,309	KRANENDONK, DIRK		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Norca L. Torres-Velazquez	1771		

	Norca L. Torres-Velazquez	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 October 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid abaidavit, or other eviden	ce, which
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 706.07(f).	g date of the final rejection of the FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of e under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi or than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beautiful appeal; and/or	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); etter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 		mpliant Amendment	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13 and 22-40. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will will be will will will will will will will wil	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•	
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a No nd sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeary and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	or the states of the claims after el	miry is below or attact	eu.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered b <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	Norca L. Torres-Ve Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1771	lazquez

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the particular argument regarding claim 36, it is noted that the present invention describes "non-woven rigid fiber tissue" in paragraph [0021] of the published document as having a weight of around 20-50 gsm and discloses that any type of rigid fiber may bused including carbon, metal, glass or other type of natural or synthetic fiber that are well known in the art that are not too soft or extensible. The prior art of Jackson (refer to Col. 4, lines 6-61); teaches the use of hydroentangled nonwoven fabrics and teaches that these are generally exceptionally strong and soft. The nonwoven, hydroentangled ply or backing can be made of generally any synthetic fibers, cellulosic fibers, mineral fibers such as glass, or any combinations of any of the foregoing. The reference teaches that suitable thicknesses for the nonwoven poly can vary and the fabric weight can vary considerably, however, fabric weights from about 47-61 gsm are generally preferred. It is the Examiner's interpretation that the substrate described by Jackson reads on Applicant's defined "non-woven rigid fiber tissue" as equated above. All other remarks have been noted, however, the Examiner re-states herein the position from the previous office action in order to address such remarks.